

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-52 are pending in this application with Claims 32-38, 42, and 45-52 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 29 and 44 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 29, 39, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Reddy (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,355) in view of Izawa et al (European Patent No. EP 525,976 A2, herein "Izawa"); and Claims 30, 31, 40, 41, and 44 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the amendment to independent Claim 29, the allowed claims are maintained in dependent form.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 44 has been amended as suggested by the outstanding Office Action without adding new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 29, 39, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Reddy and Izawa, independent Claim 29 has been amended to recite "providing one display period and a one non-display period ... for 1 frame period." The claim amendments find support in the originally filed specification, see for example Figure 2. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 29 is directed to a liquid crystal display method to display an image according to an image signal. The method includes providing one display period and one non-display period of the image for 1 frame period, detecting a

maximum brightness level of the image signal in the 1 frame, and changing a ratio of the display period and the non-display period of the image in the 1 frame period according to the detected maximum brightness level.

Turning to the applied art, Reddy discloses a pixel frame divided into sub-frames (for example sixteen pixel sub-frames). During each sub-frame, the pixel is controlled to be in an “on” condition or in an “off” condition according to a selected one of a plurality of sequences (greyscale sequences each of which corresponds to a greyscale level for the pixel frame). That is, in Reddy, the “on” or “off” condition of each pixel is controlled according to the greyscale sequence to display an appropriate greyscale level.

On the contrary, according to the method of Claim 29, one display period and one non-display period (whose periods are changeable) are provided for 1 frame and a ratio of the display period and the non-display period of the image in the 1 frame period is changed according to the maximum brightness level of the image signal in the 1 frame.

Therefore, when the maximum brightness level is high, that is, when the image is bright, the white brightness can be enhanced by lengthening the image display period and shortening the black display period. Alternatively, when the maximum brightness level is low in the 1 frame, that is, when the image is dark, it is possible for a person watching the image to visually observe the motion image with sharp and low blurring by shortening the image display period and lengthening the black (non-display) display period. As a result, the method of Claim 29 advantageously achieves a sharp motion image, in which a dynamic range is wide and the picture quality deterioration is small.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Izawa for teaching detecting a maximum brightness of an image pixel. However, Izawa does not cure the deficiencies of Reddy discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 29 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Reddy and Izawa, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Limited Reconition No. L0037